

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 93 04:30:10 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #346
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 24 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 346

Today's Topics:

 "We must see your original license" requirement (3 msgs)
 Codeless Tech Debate (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 22 Sep 93 15:38:32 GMT
From: agate!spool.mu.edu!olivea!apple.com!catnip!kc6sss@ames.arpa
Subject: "We must see your original license" requirement
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

So I asked L. Ron Natalie, where in Part 97 this was stipulated and he
said "It's on the back of Form 610".

I happen to have a Form 610 here, dated September 1987 and nowhere
on the back or front of it does it require the examinee to show
the VEs the original copy of the license.

Yes, I know that there is a newer Form 610 out just this year.
However, VE teams have been requiring your original license for
longer than that. It's a good way to screw someone up when they
come back for their first upgrade, eh? I would hazard a guess
that one or more of the VECs suggested to the FCC that they add
this requirement to the paperwork.

Hasn't anyone ever heard of color photocopies?

Date: 23 Sep 93 20:27:00 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!olivea!apple.com!catnip!kc6sss@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: "We must see your original license" requirement
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

drt@athena.mit.edu (David R Tucker) writes:

>|> I happen to have a Form 610 here, dated September 1987 and nowhere
>|> on the back or front of it does it require the examinee to show
>|> the VEs the original copy of the license.

>Do you have the destructions? Try reading them.

Only the instructions on the form itself. A single 8.5x11" piece
of paper. The old "attach a photocopy or the original here" wording right
at the top.

>|> I would hazard a guess
>|> that one or more of the VECs suggested to the FCC that they add
>|> this requirement to the paperwork.
>|>
>|> Hasn't anyone ever heard of color photocopies?

>What do you want, a license as secure as a passport? (Fee: \$55, \$65 the
>time.) Maybe "just" a driver's license? (Imagine the wait! Don't move
>too often.)

Drivers licenses and passports are good enough to show to the cops to prove
who you are. They should be good enough to show to everyone.

>And I have doubts that this was a VEC's idea.

As I wrote: "hazard a guess". I was speculating.

>The point is that the originals are harder to *alter*.

But I can make a color photocopy of my original before I sign it, which is
why I brought them up in the first place.

>I guess the FCC just wants us to cut down on their workload. They'll catch a
>forged or altered license with their records.

Exactly. Sticking my neck out again, I would speculate that they
don't bother to check signatures.

>But getting a CSCE back

>from an applicant is a chore, sometimes an embarrassing one.

What, you go to their house to reclaim them? This I've never heard of.

Date: Thu, 23 Sep 1993 08:52:19 -0700
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node_142cf.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net
Subject: "We must see your original license" requirement
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Sep22.180148.21947@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,
markm@bigfoot.sps.mot.com (Mark Monninger) wrote:

> Ya know, I don't understand all the VEC/VE bashing I've seen lately. Why the
> hell would a VE want to 'screw someone up'? And why would the VECs want to
> create MORE paperwork?
>
> "Screw someone up"???? Sheesh...If that's a common perception, I'll find
> something else to do with my Saturday mornings.

I agree with you Mark (even if I haven't made it to as many sessions as I would like). I for one am a VE in order to contribute something to a pastime which has been a major positive effect on my life. I suspect that almost all VEs feel the same way. I have never even claimed the "expense reimbursement" due me for mileage, contributions of supplies etc. and as far as I know this too is true of most VEs.

I too have other things I can do on Saturday mornings.

--
Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

Date: 23 Sep 93 23:50:23 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!
perry@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Mike Waters (rcrw90@email.mot.com) wrote:

: To me the interesting question is "what do we do now?" Cointinue to simply
: drop license requirements until we get a "no test license"? I certainly
: hope not! Substitute some more relevent test for the General-Extra class
: licenses? Good idea, but what?

: CW does still have value as an introduction to all kinds of "radio things",
: but I cannot believe that CW is the *only* such tool. I admit though that
: I am at a loss to suggest a good substitute.

How about an equivalent three-level operator's test in some other modes
like packet, AMTOR, RTTY, etc?

Perry Scott
AA0ET

Date: 24 Sep 1993 03:40:44 GMT
From: drt@athena.mit.edu
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CDtzK0.8o@fc.hp.com> perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) writes:

How about an equivalent three-level operator's test in some other modes
like packet, AMTOR, RTTY, etc?

But these are all the same, from an operating point of view, and
the internet's better, anyway.

-drt
--

David R. Tucker KG2S drt@mit.edu
'Most political sermons teach the congregation nothing except
what newspapers are taken at the Rectory.' -C.S. Lewis

Date: 22 Sep 1993 20:15:18 -0400
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!
news.delphi.com!news.delphi.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <!--jzhvg@dixie.com>, <1993Sep17.213139.22592@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,
<CDnoqL.8C5@wang.com>
Subject : Re: Codeless Technician

"I would really have a problem with a wide band signal..."

That's why we have CW subbands -- even on 2m! -- so that the wideband modes don't monopolize all of a given band.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #346
